



Setti D. Warren
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Candace Havens
Director

MINUTES OF MEETING: **Auburndale Historic District Commission**

DATE: **May 13, 2014**

PLACE/TIME: **Newton City Hall, Room 202, 7:30 PM**

IN ATTENDANCE: **Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair**
 Patricia Baker, Member
 Patricia Bottomley, Member
 Mark Armstrong, Alternate
 Barbara Kurze, Commission Staff
 See attendance list

ABSENT: **Italo Visco, Chair**
 Richard Alfred, Member
 Rodney Barker, Member

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. with Nancy Grissom presiding as Acting Chair. Voting permanent members included P. Baker, P. Bottomley, and N. Grissom. Alternate member M. Armstrong also voted. B. Kurze, Senior Preservation Planner, acted as recording secretary and the meeting was digitally recorded on an H2 device.

30 Hancock Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Owner Kathy Curran and Ralph Cappola of Main Street Architects were present for the review of the application to build an addition.

B. Kurze read a description of the proposed project. Main Street Architects, representing the owners, Kathy Curran and Marni Osanka, submitted a proposal to build a two-story addition that would be in keeping with the architectural details and scale of the existing house. The addition would be added to the current front of the house which was oriented to face the rear of the lot. The existing front door, knee brackets and entrance roof would be re-used. The entrance would be re-oriented. Cladding, roof shingles and paint colors would match existing. New vinyl windows would match the existing windows and the existing dormer design would be carried over to the new addition. A decorative carriage style garage door was proposed for the basement level garage.

B. Kurze noted that the inventory form identified the property as Reverend Joseph L. Partridge Barn and the Louis R. Schwab House with a date of 1896. The property appeared to have been the barn associated with the 1847 Reverend Joseph L. Partridge House at 14 Hancock Street and was converted to a residence, possibly in

the late 19th century or early 20th century. B. Kurze also noted that a part of the proposed addition would be visible from Hancock Street.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Plans

Elevations

Site plan

Materials (provided at the meeting)

N. Grissom asked whether the proposed windows were vinyl and stated that the Commission usually did not approve vinyl cladding; R. Cappola stated that the proposed windows were wood with vinyl cladding to match the existing windows. N. Grissom noted that the property was currently non-conforming; R. Cappola stated that property preceded zoning and that they were told to review the project with the Auburndale Historic District Commission before meeting with the other boards. He noted that they tried to keep the character of the existing house and designed the addition to minimize the link to the house and to be sympathetic to the character and style of the existing house. R. Cappola confirmed that currently the left side of the house faced Hancock and that the front elevation faced Hancock Street in the proposed design; the existing front door and door roof would be moved to the new front elevation.

N. Grissom requested that the materials be clearly specified on the drawings. The drawings should show that the windows were wood with vinyl cladding. R. Cappola confirmed that the garage doors would be roll up wood doors that would be painted and that the existing wood siding shingles and decorative scallop-shaped shingles would be matched in style and paint color but would be a cement product. R. Cappola provided a hard copy of the material specifications.

M. Armstrong commented that he was concerned about the size of the garage as it was much bigger than the existing house. There was discussion about the design challenges posed by the size of the existing house and the lot configuration. R. Cappola noted that the current house was one bedroom and was only 18 feet; they were trying to convert it to a three-bedroom without creating one huge mass and without losing too much yard space. R. Cappola stated that the design added two bedrooms above the two-car garage and that it broke up the elements and moved them off of one plane to break the scale.

K. Curran noted that the garage would be at the far end of the structure and would not be visible from the street. M. Armstrong stated that having the garage bigger than the existing house was the opposite of what would be expected – that the garage would be secondary – and that normally this design would not be approved; he expressed concern that this would set a bad precedent. N. Grissom commented that one garage would be bigger than the existing house, but that not much of the proposed garage would be visible from the street. Other design solutions (lowering or detaching the garage) were discussed but were either not possible or resulted in losing the additional living space and usable yard space. N. Grissom noted that a design with garage doors that faced to the front was not desirable but understood that this configuration provided more usable yard space. P. Baker stated that the size and orientation of the garage would be a bigger issue if the structure was visible and set closer to the street; this was set very far back and was not that visible. N. Grissom noted that this was a unique set of circumstances: the building was extremely small and was set very far back and the only sighting was down a long driveway. P. Baker stated that the location and unique situation minimized the issues. R. Cappola and K. Curran noted that there were other structures in front of the property that would block views of the proposed addition.

N. Grissom asked about the materials of the proposed and existing shutters. K. Curran stated that the proposed shutters were vinyl and the existing shutters were wood. N. Grissom stated that the proposed shutters should be wood to match the existing.

M. Armstrong motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the substitution of materials as follows: 1) shutters are wood; 2) windows are wood with vinyl cladding; and 3) garage doors are wood. P. Baker seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously.

R. Cappola agreed that Main Street Architects would submit revised drawings with the material substitutions to B. Kurze.

N. Grissom commented that plain doors were preferable to doors with plastic hardware.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: May 13, 2014

SUBJECT: 30 Hancock Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 13, 2014 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 30 Hancock Street to build an addition with the substitution of materials as follows: 1) wood shutters; 2) wood windows with vinyl cladding; and 3) wood garage doors.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
Mark Armstrong, Alternate

Patricia Baker, Member

Patricia Bottomley, Member

90 Hancock Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

The architect, Donald Lang, represented the owner, Quentin Homan, for the review of the application to install a spiral stair and alter the existing railing to create access from a second floor tenant apartment.

B. Kurze read a description of the proposed project. The proposal was to install a prefabricated painted steel spiral stair and to alter the existing painted wood railing of the second floor deck to create an access landing for the spiral stair. The design would be in keeping with the architectural details and scale of the existing house; the intent was to provide egress from the second floor tenant apartment.

D. Lang presented additional information about the project. The Newton Inspectional Services Department (ISD) identified that there was no appropriate second means of egress from the apartment which occupied the second and third floor on the east side of the building (away from Hancock Street). The preferred solution to connect to interior stairs was not accepted by ISD and a traditional exterior stairway would have had a very large footprint of approximately 120 square feet. The proposed spiral stair would have a footprint of about 16 square feet; it would not be visible from Lasell Street and most of it would be screened by the columns and structure of the porch when viewed from Hancock Street. D. Lang noted that the building footprint on the City of Newton Assessor's Map did not include the porch structure. The steel stairway with the galvanized finish would be painted to match the color of the clapboard siding to make it less visible. The existing balcony had a door so would only have to cut an opening in the existing handrail. They did not push the spiral stair back against the building because it would block an important original punched-out dining room window.

Materials Reviewed:*Photos**Plans**Elevations**Site plan (City of Newton Assessor's Map)**Materials*

M. Armstrong commented that it was a compromise solution but probably the best that could be hoped for and that the stair would be relatively hidden; painting the stair the color of the siding would make it blend better. N. Grissom noted that there was a darker gray trim color that could work as well; D. Lang replied that the stair should blend in; they did not want to celebrate it as an element.

P. Baker motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the added requirement that the spiral stair be painted to blend in with the building. M. Armstrong seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously.

RECORD OF ACTION:**DATE:** May 13, 2014**SUBJECT:** 90 Hancock Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 13, 2014 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 90 Hancock Street to install a spiral stair and alter the existing railing to create access from a second floor tenant apartment with the added requirement that the spiral stair be painted to blend in with the building.

Voting in the Affirmative:**Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair****Patricia Baker, Member****Patricia Bottomley, Member****Mark Armstrong, Alternate****15 Cheswick Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

Marc Fournier, Director of Plant Operations and Sustainability, and architect Dan Eldredge of Eck|MacNeely Architects, represented the owner for the review of the application to alter the existing front porch, entry vestibule and porch roof to install an accessibility ramp.

B. Kurze noted that this review was continued from the April 10th meeting and read a description of the agreed upon design and material changes from the April 10th meeting as follows: the replacement door would be wood, drawings and plans would be changed to show shingles on the building exterior, decking would be composite and AZEK would be used for the railings.

B. Kurze also read the list of items for which more detail was requested to be reviewed at the May 13th meeting:

- Stepping the wall
- Wall sections under the vestibule and along the edge
- Continuation of the wall that comes up ramp

- Posts at the central windows of the house
- Posts, rails, and balusters for the peripheral railing systems
- Details of column material (options besides AZEK), shape, dimension and proportion (needed to consider the long span, big roof and heavy massing of building)
- Details for the wall section through the little knee wall
- Possible hip roof design for corner

D. Eldredge presented additional information about the revised drawings. They added the following: details for the stepped wall, the shingle pattern (shingles would be cedar same as existing), details about the railings, the trim and the column. He noted that the proposed column was AZEK wrapped, eight inches square with a profile to match the existing pilaster engaged in corner of the vestibule; the column would replace the existing wrought iron lattice column. D. Eldredge stated that the railings must meet the accessibility code; they must be round in profile and no more than one-and-a-half to two inches. He also noted that every stair must have a handrail on both sides and that they could not do a wood cap rail. D. Eldredge also noted that the rail to the right of the door would be an AZEK railing system that would mimic the wood rail system on the back of the house.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Plans

Elevations

Details

Site plan

Materials

M. Armstrong asked about the railing by the parking lot. D. Eldredge stated that they tried to minimize the impact as much as possible and since the drop on the left hand side was minimal they only need a handrail. M. Fournier commented that the intent was that one could look through it and it would disappear. M. Armstrong asked whether there should be a match; D. Eldredge replied that the handrails matched but that one was attached with brackets to the guardrail and the other was on metal posts.

M. Armstrong commented that the stepped knee wall looked good and asked whether the section was capped. D. Eldredge stated that they meant to have an AZEK cap; they did not have a drawing of that section but it was a clad two-by-four wall with a cap that was five-and-a-half-inches wide with shingles on both sides. N. Grissom asked if the cap was a flat cap or a more decorated cap; D. Eldredge replied that it was a flat cap, five-quarter AZEK. M. Fournier noted that the cap mimicked the straight lines of the building. M. Armstrong stated that the top of the knee wall should coordinate with the top of the rail. M. Armstrong noted that needed some kind of profile instead of flat stock and also needed a base for the columns since the capital was articulated. M. Armstrong stated that Commission members did not want the applicants to have to come back to another meeting because of the missing knee wall section drawing; M. Armstrong stated that the knee wall section needed to have the following: trim that turned the corner and had a profile, and a base for the column. M. Armstrong recommended a larger, square piece for the base; D. Eldredge proposed a square shaped, inch-and-a-half piece that stuck out on either side of the base. D. Eldredge stated that the builder recommended that a copper standing seam be used for the hip to minimize leaking issues.

M. Armstrong motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the added requirements that: 1) the column at the corner would have a base one-and-a-half inches thick and one inch reveal to the column; 2) the knee wall at the ramp and at the porch would have a cap with a similar profile

to the railing system that is adjacent; 3) the hipped roof would have a copper standing seam; and 4) staff would review the drawings to confirm changes made. P. Baker seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously.

M. Fournier asked whether there was precedence for installing solar roof panels in the Auburndale Historic District; M. Armstrong noted that the Commission had approved applications for solar panels with the requirement that the conduits and rooting mechanicals be concealed so as to be less obtrusive; the preference was that the conduit go into the attic. The Commission also required that the least obtrusive panels in terms of color, size, shape and configuration be used.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: May 13, 2014

SUBJECT: 15 Cheswick Road - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 13, 2014 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 15 Cheswick Road to alter the existing front porch, entry vestibule and porch roof to install an accessibility ramp with the added requirements that: 1) the column at the corner would have a base one-and-a-half inches thick and one inch reveal to the column; 2) the knee wall at the ramp and at the porch would have a cap with a similar profile to the railing system that is adjacent; 3) the hipped roof would have a copper standing seam; and 4) staff would review the drawings to confirm changes made.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
Mark Armstrong, Alternate

Patricia Baker, Member

Patricia Bottomley, Member

71 Vista Avenue – Certificate of Appropriateness

Owner Al Mendelsohn and Michael McKay of McKay Architects were present for the review of the application to add a partial second floor and demolish a one-story rear addition.

B. Kurze read a description of the proposed project. The proposed project would demolish a one-story rear addition and add a partial second floor to the existing circa 1950 one-story ranch with a side gable roof and a wing on the left side with a cross-gable roof. The proposed plan was for an asymmetrical U-shaped front elevation – a one-story central section with a two-story wing on each side; the style included elements of Shingle style and Colonial Revival. The proposed plan would expand the right front section of the house by extending the existing first floor footprint toward Vista Avenue. A second floor would be added to the front left and expanded front right sections. A dormer would be added to the center section and a dormer was proposed for the new second story on the left front section. Front gables were proposed for the left and right front sections, the chimney profile would be modified and the existing windows would be replaced. The proposed shingle cladding was consistent with the current cladding.

M. McKay presented additional information about the project and provided a hard copy of the revised drawings which included information about materials and the comparison of the proposed front elevation to the existing. The intent was to repurpose the existing ranch. Proposed plan removed the rear addition to open up the rear elevation and allow more light; also added partial second floor to create more living space. The

windows would be wood metal clad and would replace but not replicate the existing windows. Materials used included wood trim, AZEK sills, AZEK water table and an asphalt shingle roof. They did not want to replicate the traditional shingle style but wanted to incorporate shingle style elements in what was a modern home in a neighborhood of very detailed houses. They expanded the garage and created additional living space. Dormers were added to expand the living space. The proposed garage doors would face the side of the property. M. McKay noted that the proposed plan was at about 50 percent of allowed FAR.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Plans

Elevations

Site plan (City of Newton Assessor's Map)

N. Grissom asked whether the gables on the front elevation were applied; M. McKay stated that they were real cross-gables. M. McKay noted that the garage would extend out and would be a three-car garage with three doors which would be simple wood doors separated by a one-foot column. There would be additional living space and a new mud room entrance. The existing chimney would be extended and covered with fieldstone. The roof on the left side would come off to allow for the partial second floor.

M. Armstrong stated that the Commission members needed to discuss the historic nature of the existing ranch; he commented that the building was a poor example of the ranch style and was typical of a generic in-fill builder's house. N. Grissom noted that a nearby ranch had also been renovated; the original ranch was also a poor example. M. Armstrong commented that it was positive that the middle section, which was the nicest part, was being preserved. M. Armstrong also commented that the new design was terrific and brought the building to life. N. Grissom commented that it was also positive that they were keeping the gable format. M. Armstrong stated that the scale and proportion was appropriate for the neighborhood, the footprint was not significantly changed even though the site could have supported a much larger house and the size and articulation were nicely restrained.

M. Armstrong motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted. P. Baker seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: May 13, 2014

SUBJECT: 71 Vista Avenue - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 13, 2014 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 71 Vista Avenue to add a partial second floor and demolish a one-story rear addition.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
Mark Armstrong, Alternate

Patricia Baker, Member

Patricia Bottomley, Member

40 Groveland Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Owner Celia Morris was present for the review of the application to replace six or seven basement windows.

B. Kurze read a description of the proposed project. Six single pane wood frame casement windows which measured 30 x 18 inches would be replaced as part of the Mass Save Energy Audit program. The proposed replacement windows were Hopper double pane windows with white exterior, white base color, full screen, OH2V operating sash, contour grids and standard hardware. The windows would also have low-e coating and be argon gas-filled. One of the proposed windows would have a dryer vent to match the current configuration. Three of the windows were located in a below ground well and three were at ground level in the foundation and were covered with bubbles. The owners may also request to replace one window on the stairs which has not yet been scoped.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Materials

M. Armstrong asked how visible the existing windows were; C. Morris stated that they were barely visible. Windows in front were in metal wells covered by bubbles. Others are further back and not visible from the street. N. Grissom and M. Armstrong asked about the material of the replacement windows; C. Morris stated that they were not wood windows. N. Grissom noted that the window materials mentioned UPVC frames and sashes. M. Armstrong asked if the basement was inhabited space; C. Morris stated that it was not. C. Morris noted that they wanted operable windows in order to vent the space. M. Armstrong stated that the Commission members were most concerned with the appropriateness of the materials; vinyl windows would not be a good match. C. Morris noted that all of the other windows in the house had already been replaced with vinyl when they bought the house. C. Morris stated that the Mass Save Energy Audit contractor proposed the UPVC windows. N. Grissom requested that the owners ask the contractor if they had windows available through the program that were not PVC; aluminum clad wood and fiberglass (similar to Andersen Renewal windows) look better and would be acceptable.

N. Grissom noted that it might be possible to repair the side window and put on an outside storm window. P. Baker stated that the windows were barely visible but that it would be preferable not to use vinyl windows and to use windows that look more like wood. M. Armstrong stated that the owners should look for a wood window clad with aluminum or vinyl; could ask the contractor to attend the meeting. C. Morris stated that the owners had already signed a contract pending approval of the Commission. N. Grissom proposed that the owners should talk with the contractor about what windows could be provided and then discuss with B. Kurze. M. Armstrong stated that the standards were clad wood at a minimum, simulated divided lights must match the pattern, size and profile of the existing windows, and must be on the interior and the exterior window surfaces. N. Grissom and M. Armstrong noted that the window materials provided were not clear as to which windows would be used.

M. Armstrong motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the condition that the windows would: 1) be aluminum or vinyl clad wood at a minimum; 2) have simulated divided lights that match the pattern, size and profile of the existing windows; and 3) have simulated divided lights on the interior and the exterior window surfaces. The proposed side window replacement would require the same specifications. The specifications would be submitted to Commission Staff for review and approval. P. Baker seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE:

May 13, 2014

SUBJECT: 40 Groveland Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 13, 2014 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 40 Groveland Street to replace six basement windows with the condition that the windows would: 1) be aluminum or vinyl clad wood at a minimum; 2) have simulated divided lights that match the pattern, size and profile of the existing windows; and 3) have simulated divided lights on the interior and the exterior window surfaces. The proposed side window replacement would require the same specifications. The specifications would be submitted to Commission Staff for review and approval.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair

Patricia Baker, Member

Patricia Bottomley, Member

Mark Armstrong, Alternate

Administrative Discussion

Approval of Minutes

The Commission approved the April 2014 minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Recorded by Barbara Kurze, Senior Preservation Planner